"Express Mail" mailing label number EV 906854700 US

Date of Deposit: July 23, 2007

Our Case No. 10022/18

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	)	
Gary Como et al.	)	
Serial No. 09/710,154	)	Examiner: Robinson Boyce, Akiba K.
Filing Date: November 9, 2000	)	Group Art Unit No. 3623
For METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR BUSINESS PLANNING VIA A COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK	)	

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This Appeal is in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 19, 2007[1].

---

[1] Appellants filed a Notice of Appeal on May 21, 2007. Since the Notice of Appeal was filed within three months of the mailing of the Office Action and the present Appeal Brief is being filed within two months of the filing of the Notice of Appeal, the present Appeal Brief is timely filed. Furthermore, the Appeal Brief fee filed on March 25, 2005 should be applied to pay the fee for the present Appeal Brief.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

Accenture L.L.P. is the real party of interest in this Appeal.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

The undersigned, John C. Freeman, is not aware of any other appeals, interferences or other judicial proceedings that may be related to, would directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending Appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 18-22, 34-37 and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,893,076 to Hafner et al.[2]

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being obvious in view of Hafner et al.

Claims 14-16, 18-20, 22, 40 and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being obvious in view of Hafner et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,125,391

---

[2] While the Advisory Action mailed on April 12, 2007 indicated that claims 42-44, presented in Appellants' Amendment of January 19, 2007 and after the mailing of the Final Office Action, were rejected, it did not specify the basis for the rejection. The undersigned contacted Examiner Robinson Boyce on May 14, 2007 and she indicated that the claims were to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hafner et al.

to Meltzer et al.[3]

Claims 1, 6, 11-13, 17, 23-33, 39 and 41 are canceled.

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 14-16, 18-22, 34-38, 40 and 42-47 are appealed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Appellants filed an Amendment in response to the Final Office Action mailed on January 19, 2007. The Amendment was entered per the Advisory Action mailed on April 12, 2007 (hereinafter "the Advisory Action").

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

An understanding of the invention of independent Claims 7 and 14 can be made upon a review of the embodiments of the inventions shown in FIGS. 1-7 of the specification. Note that in the description to follow, like elements will employ identical identification numerals. FIG. 1 shows an embodiment of a system 9 for business planning that facilitates efficient communications and the exchange of information between a first data management system 11 affiliated with a first business entity and a second data management system 13 affiliated with a second business entity (P. 4, ll. 10-13). As shown in FIG. 1, the first

---

[3] While the Advisory Action mailed on April 12, 2007 indicated that claims 45-47, presented in Appellants' Amendment of January 19, 2007 and after the mailing of the Final Office Action, were rejected, it did not specify the basis for the rejection. The undersigned contacted Examiner Robinson Boyce on May 14, 2007 and she indicated that the claims were to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being obvious in view of Hafner et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,125,391 to Meltzer et al.

management system 11 includes a first enterprise resource planning (ERP) system 10 and a first data processing system 14 (P. 4, ll. 14-15). The second data management system 13 includes a second enterprise resource planning system 34 and a second data processing system 26 (P. 4, ll. 15-17). The first and second data management systems (11, 13) communicate via a communications network 22 (P. 4, ll. 17-19).

The first ERP system 10 is coupled to the first data processing system 14 (P. 4, l. 20). The first data processing system 14 is arranged to communicate with the communications network 22 (P. 4, ll. 21-22). The communications network 22 is arranged to communicate with the second data processing system 26 (P. 4, ll. 22-23). The second data processing system 26 is coupled to the second ERP system 34 (P. 4, ll. 23-24). The first ERP system 10, the second ERP system 34, or both include a user interface 24 for presenting data associated with the respective ERP systems (P. 4, ll. 24-26).

The first ERP system 10 includes a requirement-indicating database 12 (P. 5, l. 3). The requirement-indicating database 12 provides requirement data on a transactional subject (P. 5, ll. 4-5). The transactional subject may refer to the provision of a material, a good, a product, a service, a financial transaction, or any combination of the foregoing items (P. 5, ll. 5-7). Requirement data refers to information that is useful in managing or conducting a commercial activity or a transaction involving a 15 transactional subject (P. 5, ll. 7-9). For example, the requirement data may be used to make one or more business decisions related

to the transactional subject (P. 5, ll. 9-11). Although the first ERP system 10 may establish the requirement-indicating database 12 as part of the normal operation of the first ERP system 10, in an alternative embodiment the first data processing system 14 may establish a requirement-indicating database 12 for storage in the first ERP system 10, in the first data processing system 14, or elsewhere (P. 5, ll. 11-16).

The first data processing system 14 includes a data extractor 16, a data format converter 18, and a transmitter 20 (P. 5, ll. 17-18). The data extractor 16 extracts relevant data from the requirement-indicating database 12 (P. 5, ll. 18-19). The data extractor 16 communicates the extracted data with a data format converter 18 which communicates with the transmitter 20 (P. 5, ll. 19-21).

The data extractor 16 includes an extraction algorithm that mines relevant requirement data from the requirement-indicating database 12 (P. 5, ll. 29-30). Relevant requirement data is pertinent to the transactional subject, the relationship between the first business entity and the second business entity, or both (P. 5, l. 30 – P. 6, l. 2).

The extractor 16 may include a filter that filters the requirement data in the requirement-indicating database 12 to obtain extracted relevant data (P. 6, ll. 13-14). The data format converter 18 accepts the extracted requirement data and formats the extracted requirement data into a suitable data structure for transmission over the communications system 22 to the second data processing system 26 (P. 6, ll. 23-26).

The transmitter 20 accepts the formatted requirement data from the data format converter 18 (P. 7, ll. 6-7). The transmitter 20 places the formatted requirement data in a suitable physical form for communication over the communications network 22 (P. 7, ll. 7-9).

The second data processing system 26 has a receiver 28 that receives the data transmission in the physical form transmitted by the transmitter 20 (P. 7, ll. 21-23). The data format translator 30 is adapted to translate the received data into a structured data format that is compatible with the second ERP system 34 (P. 8, ll. 3-5).

One or more user interfaces 24 are coupled to the first ERP system 10, the second ERP system 34, or both (P. 8, ll. 19-20). The user interface 24 may include a monitor for displaying source data of the first ERP system 10 or destination data of the second ERP system 34 (P. 8, ll. 20-22). The user interface 24 promotes the ability to check for errors and readily check on the status of the business relationship (P. 8, ll. 25-27).

The first data processing system 14 and the second data processing system 26 automate the extraction of data from the first ERP system 10 and the loading of data into the second ERP system 34, respectively (P. 9. ll. 1-3).

FIG. 2 illustrates a method for business planning that may be implemented in a manner consistent with the system of FIG. 1 (P. 9, ll. 9-11). In one example, a first entity may represent a business entity, which is a customer of a second

business entity (P. 9, ll. 11-12). Accordingly, the second business entity may be considered a supplier to the first business entity (P. 9, ll. 12-13).

In step S10 shown in FIG. 2, a first data processing system 14 obtains requirement indicating data of the first entity with respect to a transactional subject (P. 9, ll. 15-16). The transactional subject refers to a good, service, product, material, financial transaction, or any combination of the foregoing items (P. 9, ll. 16-18). The requirement indicating data may represent forecast data, demand data, consumption data, inventory data, or any other data that impacts characteristics of a transaction or commercial activity involving the transactional subject (P. 9, ll. 18-21). The demand data may shown an actual or present demand for a material, good, product, financial transaction, or service (P. 9. ll. 22-24).

In step S12, the first data processing system 14 automatically transmits the obtained requirement-indicating data from a first business entity to a second business entity over the communications network 22 (P. 10, ll. 5-7). As used herein, automatically refers to an electronic action that supports interoperability and communication between different electronic processors (e.g., ERP systems) associated with distinct business entities, where the electronic action is completed with minimal or no human intervention (P. 10, ll. 7-11). Accordingly, the first data processing system 14 preferably transmits the obtained requirement-indicating data with minimal or no human intervention (P. 10, ll. 12-15).

In step S14, the second data processing system 26 receives the transmission from the first data processing system 14 via the communications network 22 (P. 11, ll. 21-22). Further, the second data processing system 26 automatically feeds the received requirement indicating data into an electronic processor for tracking the transactional data (P. 11, ll. 23-25). In one embodiment, the second data processing system 26 feeds the received requirement-indicating data into the second ERP system 34 with minimal or no human intervention to facilitate reduced transaction cycle time and greater accuracy in the commercial activity concerning the transactional subject (P. 11, ll. 27-30).

In step S16 shown in FIG. 2, the second data processing system 26 generates or facilitates the generation of a business decision of the first business entity, the second business entity, or both based on the requirement-indicating data (P. 12, ll. 6-8). The business decision generally includes an order processing decision, a logistic decision, or both (P. 12, ll. 8-10). An order processing decision involves an automated or human decision to purchase a transactional subject, engage in a commercial transaction, order a transactional subject based on the requirement-indicating data, or any combination of the foregoing (P. 12, ll. 10-13). A logistic decision impacts how, when, and where the order processing characteristics are executed (P. 12, ll. 13-14).

FIG. 3 shows a block diagram of an embodiment of the system 109 for business planning, which is similar to that of FIG. 1, except FIG. 3 includes a

demand-indicating database 36, instead of a requirement-indicating database 12 (P. 14, ll. 21-23). Like reference numbers indicate like elements in FIG. 1 and FIG. 3.

The demand-indicating database 36 of FIG. 3 may represent one possible example of a requirement-indicating database 12 of FIG. 1 (P. 14, ll. 25-26). As shown in FIG. 3, the demand-indicating database 36 includes forecast data 38 and demand data 40 (P. 14, ll. 26-27). If the first business entity represent a customer and the second business entity represents a supplier of the customer, then the forecast data 38 represents the prospective demand of the first business entity for a product, service, good, financial transaction, or material provided by the second business entity (P. 14, l. 28 – P. 15, l. 4). Similarly, the demand data 40 represents an actual, a present, or an estimated demand for a good, service, product, material, or financial transaction provided by the second business entity to the first business entity (P. 15, ll. 2-4).

The first data processing system 14 cooperates with the communications network 22 and the second data processing system 26 to assure the accurate transmission of the forecast data 38 from the source or first ERP system 110 to the destination or second ERP system 34 (P. 15, ll. 10-13).

FIG. 4 shows a method for automated business planning consistent with the system 109 of FIG. 3. In the initial step S18, the first data processing system 14 accesses demand-indicating data within a demand-indicating database 36 associated with a first ERP system 110 (P. 15, ll. 21-23). Further, the first data

processing system 14 extracts a relevant portion of the demand-indicating data with respect to a transactional subject (P. 15, ll. 23-26). The demand-indicating data refers to forecast data 38, demand data 40, or both (P. 15, ll. 27-28).

In step S20, the first data processing system 14 automatically transmits the obtained demand-indicating data from a first business entity to a second business entity over the communications network 22 (P. 16, ll. 7-9).

In step S22, the second data processing system 26 receives the demand indicating data that was transmitted in step S20 (P. 16, ll. 15-16). The second data processing system 26 automatically feeds the transmitted demand-indicating data into an electronic processor for tracking the demand-indicating data (P. 16, ll. 16-18).

In step S24, the electronic processor (e.g., second ERP system 34) generates a business decision or facilitates the generation of a business decision of the second business entity based on the demand-indicating data (P. 16, ll. 24-26). For example, the first ERP system 110, the second ERP system 34, or both may display demand-indicating data or a proposed commercial transaction on a user interface to assist a user in making a business decision (P. 16. ll. 26-29).

A. <u>The Invention of Claim 7</u>

With the above summary in mind, claim 7 claims the invention as a method for planning a business decision, the method including obtaining requirement-indicating data of a first entity with respect to a transactional subject, wherein the obtaining includes extracting a subset of the requirement-indicating

data from a requirement-indicating database associated with an enterprise resource planning system, wherein the extracting process is selected from the group consisting of a process based on compatibility of a processing system of a second business entity to receive the extracted subset, a process based on previous history of usefulness of prior extracted data, a process based on a model for managing the transactional subject and a process based on properties of the database. An example of such obtaining and extracting is the mining processes performed by the data extractor 16 shown in FIG. 1 and step S10 of FIG. 2 (P. 5, l. 29 – P. 6, l. 22 and P. 9, l. 15 – P. 10, l. 4). The claimed method further entails automatically transmitting the obtained requirement-indicating data from a first business entity to a second business entity over a communications network. An example of such transmitting is the transmission of the extracted requirement data from first data processing system 14 to second data processing system 26 via communications system 22 of FIG. 1 and step S12 of FIG. 2 (P. 6, ll. 23-26 and P. 10, ll. 5-7). The claimed method entails automatically feeding the transmitted requirement-indicating data into an electronic processor for monitoring the transactional subject, the electronic processor being associated with an electronic processing system of the second business entity. An example of such feeding of transmitted requirement-indicating data is the process S14 of FIG. 2 (P. 11, ll. 21-25). The method further entails generating a business decision of the first business entity and the second business entity that is based on the requirement-indicating data and that is made solely by the electronic

processing system without the need for manual data entry into or manual data extraction from the electronic processing system. An example of such generating a business decision is the process S16 of FIG. 2 (P. 12, ll. 6-13).

B. <u>The Invention of Claim 14</u>

Claim 14 claims the invention as a method for planning a business decision, the method including obtaining demand-indicating data with respect to a transactional subject, wherein the obtaining includes extracting a relevant portion of the demand-indicating data from a database, wherein the extracting process is selected from the group consisting of a process based on compatibility of a processing system of a second business entity to receive the extracted subset, a process based on previous history of usefulness of prior extracted data, a process based on a model for managing the transactional subject and a process based on properties of the database. An example of such obtaining and extracting is the mining processes performed by the data extractor 16 shown in FIG. 3 and step S18 of FIG. 4 (P. 5, l. 29 – P. 6, l. 22 and P. 16, l. 7-14). The claimed method includes formatting the extracted relevant portion of the demand-indicating data into an extensible mark-up language document. An example of such formatting is performed in step S20 of FIG. 4 (P. 16, ll. 12-14). The claimed method further entails automatically transmitting the extracted relevant portion of the demand-indicating data from a first business entity to a second business entity over a

communications network. An example of such transmitting is the transmission of the extracted demand data from first data processing system 14 to second data processing system 26 via communications system 22 of FIG. 3 and step S20 of FIG. 4 (P. 16, ll. 7-12). The claimed method entails automatically feeding the transmitted demand-indicating data into an electronic processor for tracking the demand-indicating data, the electronic processor being associated with an electronic processing system of the second business entity. An example of such feeding of transmitted demand-indicating data is the process S22 of FIG. 4 (P. 16, ll. 15-19). The method further entails generating a business decision of the first business entity and the second business entity that is based on the demand-indicating data and that is made solely by the electronic processing system without the need for manual data entry into or manual data extraction from the electronic processing system. An example of such generating a business decision is the process S24 of FIG. 4 (P. 12, ll. 6-13).

There are no means-plus-function terms or step-plus-function terms in independent claims 7 or 14 or dependent claims 8, 18-22, 38, 40 or 42-47, which are argued separately below in Section VII. This statement is not to be construed to be an admission that the remaining claims on Appeal claims 2-5, 9, 10, 15, 16 or 34-37 contain means-plus-function terms or step-plus-function terms.

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

There are three grounds of rejection presented for review:

1) the rejection of claims 2-5, 7-10, 18-22, 34-37 and 42-44 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Hafner et al.;

2) the rejection of claim 38 for being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Hafner et al.; and

3) the rejection of claims 14-16, 18-20, 22, 40 and 45-47 for being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al.

VII. ARGUMENT

A. 35 U.S.C. § 102

1. Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 10 and 34-37

Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 10 and 34-37 were rejected in the Final Office Action of January 19, 2007 (hereinafter "the Final Office Action") under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hafner et al. Appellants traverse the rejection. Claim 7 recites "the extracting process is selected from the group consisting of a process based on compatibility of a processing system of a second business entity to receive the extracted subset, a process based on previous history of usefulness of prior extracted data, a process based on a model for managing the transactional subject and a process based on properties of the database." The Examiner at page 5 of the Final Office Action has relied on the passages at column 3, lines 34-64, column 5, lines 10-19 and column 10, lines 50-56 and 63-

65 as disclosing each of the four cited extraction processes. A review of the passages reveals that none of them discloses any of the recited extraction processes mentioned above. For example, the passage at column 10, lines 50-56 refers to a menu for maintaining and controlling forecasting functions. Since the remaining portions of Hafner et al. do not disclose any one of the extracting process options recited in claim 7, claim 7 is not anticipated by Hafner et al. and its dependent claims 2-6, 8-10 and 34-37 are not anticipated by Hafner et al.

For the above reasons, the rejection of claim 7 is improper and should be reversed. Claims 2-5, 9, 10 and 34-37 depend directly or indirectly on claim 7 and so their rejections should be reversed for the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 7.

2. Claim 8

Claim 8 was rejected in the Final Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hafner et al. Appellants traverse the rejection for several reasons. First, claim 8 depends directly on claim 7 and so its rejection should be reversed for the same reasons stated at pages 14-15 above in Section VII.A.1 with respect to claim 7.

The rejection is improper for the additional reason that Hafner et al. does not disclose nor suggest transmitting superseding requirement-indicating data on an as-needed basis as recite in claim 8. For example, the passages at column 4, lines 1-12, column 5, lines 15-33 and column 6, lines 10-22 relied on by the Examiner at page 7 of the Final Office Action do not disclose or suggest such

transmitting. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be reversed.

3. Claim 42

Claim 42 was rejected for the first time in the Advisory Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hafner et al. Appellants traverse the rejection for several reasons. First, claim 42 depends directly on claim 7 and so its rejection should be reversed for the same reasons stated at pages 14-15 above in Section VII.A.1 with respect to claim 7.

The rejection is improper for the additional reason that Hafner et al. does not disclose nor suggest the extracting process being "based on compatibility of a processing system of a second business entity to receive the extracted subset" as recited in claim 42. The Examiner has asserted at page 5 of the Final Office Action that such a process is disclosed at column 3, lines 34-64 of Hafner et al. A review of the passage and the remaining portions of Hafner et al. reveals that the recited process is not disclosed in Hafner et al. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be reversed.

4. Claim 43

Claim 43 was rejected for the first time in the Advisory Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hafner et al. Appellants traverse the rejection for several reasons. First, claim 43 depends directly on claim 7 and so its rejection should be reversed for the same reasons stated at pages 14-15 above in Section VII.A.1 with respect to claim 7.

The rejection is improper for the additional reason that Hafner et al. does

not disclose nor suggest the extracting process being "based on previous history of usefulness of prior extracted data" as recited in claim 43. The Examiner has asserted at page 5 of the Final Office Action that such a process is disclosed at column 10, lines 50-56 of Hafner et al. A review of the passage and the remaining portions of Hafner et al. reveals that the recited process is not disclosed in Hafner et al. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be reversed.

5. Claim 44

Claim 44 was rejected for the first time in the Advisory Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hafner et al. Appellants traverse the rejection for several reasons. First, claim 44 depends directly on claim 7 and so its rejection should be reversed for the same reasons stated at pages 14-15 above in Section VII.A.1 with respect to claim 7.

The rejection is improper for the additional reason that Hafner et al. does not disclose nor suggest the extracting process being "based on a model for managing the transactional subject" as recited in claim 44. The Examiner has asserted at page 5 of the Final Office Action that such a process is disclosed at column 10, lines 63-65 of Hafner et al. A review of the passage and the remaining portions of Hafner et al. reveals that the recited process is not disclosed in Hafner et al. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be reversed.

6. Claims 18-22

Claims 18-22 were rejected in the Final Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hafner et al. Appellants traverse the rejection. In particular, claims 18-22 depend from claim 14 which the Examiner at page 12 of the Final Office Action conceded was not anticipated by Hafner et al. Since Hafner et al. does not disclose formatting an extracted relevant portion of demand-indicating data into an extensible mark-up language document as recited in claim 14, the rejection should be reversed.

B. 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Hafner et al.

Claim 38 was rejected in the Final Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Hafner et al. Appellants traverse the rejection. In particular, claim 38 recites an extracting process "based on properties of the database." The Examiner at page 9 of the Final Office Action asserted that column 8, lines 55-63 of Hafner et al. disclose the recited extraction process. The passage refers to display fields and is silent as to the recited extraction process. Since no reason has been given why Hafner et al. would be altered to use the recited extraction process, the rejection is improper and should be reversed.

2. Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al.

a. Claims 14-16, 18-20 and 22

Claims 14-16, 18-20 and 22 were rejected in the Final Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. Appellants traverse the rejection. In particular, independent claim 14 recites "the extracting process is selected from the group consisting of a process based on compatibility of a processing system of a second business entity to receive the extracted subset, a process based on previous history of usefulness of prior extracted data, a process based on a model for managing the transactional subject and a process based on properties of the database." Such an extracting process is recited in claim 7. While the Examiner at page 10 of the Final Office Action asserted that various passages at columns 3, 5 and 10 of Hafner et al. disclose the recited extraction process, the passages are silent as to the recited extraction process as pointed out at pages 14-15 above in Section VII.A.1 with respect to claim 7. Since no reason has been given to alter Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. to perform the recited extracting process, the rejection should be reversed.

For the above reasons, the rejection of claim 14 is improper and should be reversed. Claims 15, 16, 18-20 and 22 depend directly or indirectly on claim 14 and so their rejections should be reversed for the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 14.

b. Claim 40

Claim 40 was rejected in the Final Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. Appellants traverse the rejection for several reasons. First, claim 40 depends directly on claim 14, so that the rejection should be reversed for the reasons stated above at page 19 in Subsection 2.a.

The rejection is improper for the additional reason that there has been no reason given to alter Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. to perform the recited extracting process "based on properties of the database." The Examiner at page 9 of the Final Office Action asserted that column 8, lines 55-63 of Hafner et al. disclose the recited extraction process. The passage refers to display fields and is silent as to the recited extraction process. Since no reason has been given why Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. would be altered to use the recited extraction process, the rejection is improper and should be reversed.

c. Claim 45

Claim 45 was first rejected in the Advisory Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. Appellants traverse the rejection for several reasons. First, claim 45 depends directly on claim 14 so that the rejection should be reversed for the reasons stated above at page 19 in Subsection 2.a.

The rejection is improper for the additional reason that there has been no reason given to alter Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. to perform the recited

extracting process "based on compatibility of a processing system of a second business entity to receive the extracted subset." The Examiner has asserted at page 5 of the Final Office Action that such a process is disclosed at column 3, lines 34-64 of Hafner et al. A review of the passage and the remaining portions of Hafner et al. reveals that the recited process is not disclosed in Hafner et al. Since no reason has been given why Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. would be altered to use the recited extraction process, the rejection is improper and should be reversed.

d. Claim 46

Claim 46 was first rejected in the Advisory Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. Appellants traverse the rejection for several reasons. First, claim 46 depends directly on claim 14 so that the rejection should be reversed for the reasons stated above at page 19 in Subsection 2.a.

The rejection is improper for the additional reason that there has been no reason given to alter Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. to perform the recited extracting process "based on previous history of usefulness of prior extracted data." The Examiner has asserted at page 5 of the Final Office Action that such a process is disclosed at column 10, lines 50-56 of Hafner et al. A review of the passage and the remaining portions of Hafner et al. reveals that the recited process is not disclosed in Hafner et al. Since no reason has been given why Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. would be altered to use the recited extraction

process, the rejection is improper and should be reversed.

e. Claim 47

Claim 47 was first rejected in the Advisory Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. Appellants traverse the rejection for several reasons. First, claim 47 depends directly on claim 14 so that the rejection should be reversed for the reasons stated above at page 19 in Subsection 2.a.

The rejection is improper for the additional reason that there has been no reason given to alter Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. to perform the recited extracting process "based on a model for managing the transactional subject" as recited in claim 44. The Examiner has asserted at page 5 of the Final Office Action that such a process is disclosed at column 10, lines 63-65 of Hafner et al. A review of the passage and the remaining portions of Hafner et al. reveals that the recited process is not disclosed in Hafner et al. Since no reason has been given why Hafner et al. and Meltzer et al. would be altered to use the recited extraction process, the rejection is improper and should be reversed.

For the reasons give above, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections should be REVERSED.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Freeman
Registration No. 34,483
Attorney for Appellants
BRINKS HOFER
GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 321-4200

Dated: July 23, 2007

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

2. The method according to claim 7 wherein the obtaining comprises obtaining demand-indicating data, the demand-indicating data including at least one of demand data and forecast data on the transactional subject.

3. The method according to claim 7 wherein the obtaining comprises obtaining inventory-tracking data, the inventory-tracking data including at least one of consumption data and inventory data.

4. The method according to claim 7 wherein the generating comprises generating an order as the business decision, the order being for the transactional subject based on the requirement-indicating data.

5. The method according to claim 7 wherein the generating comprises generating a shipping instruction as the business decision, the shipping instruction being for the transactional subject based on the requirement indicating data.

7. A method for planning a business decision, the method comprising:

obtaining requirement-indicating data of a first entity with respect to a transactional subject, wherein the obtaining comprises extracting a subset of

the requirement-indicating data from a requirement-indicating database associated with an enterprise resource planning system, wherein the extracting process is selected from the group consisting of a process based on compatibility of a processing system of a second business entity to receive the extracted subset, a process based on previous history of usefulness of prior extracted data, a process based on a model for managing the transactional subject and a process based on properties of the database;

automatically transmitting the obtained requirement-indicating data from a first business entity to a second business entity over a communications network;

automatically feeding the transmitted requirement-indicating data into an electronic processor for monitoring the transactional subject, the electronic processor being associated with an electronic processing system of the second business entity; and

generating a business decision of the first business entity and the second business entity that is based on the requirement-indicating data and that is made solely by the electronic processing system without the need for manual data entry into or manual data extraction from the electronic processing system.

8. The method according to claim 7 wherein the transmitting comprises transmitting superseding requirement-indicating data on an as-needed basis to replace prior requirement-indicating data at the second business entity.

9. The method according to claim 7 wherein the transmitting comprises transmitting differential data for expressing a change with respect to prior requirement indicating data at the second business entity.

10. The method according to claim 7 wherein the generating comprises generating the business decision on production of the transactional subject based on an exchange of the requirement-indicating data at a regular interval, the regular interval having a duration that depends upon a nature of the business of the first business entity and the second business entity.

14. A method for planning a business decision, the method comprising:

obtaining demand-indicating data with respect to a transactional subject, wherein the obtaining comprises:

extracting a relevant portion of the demand-indicating data from a database, wherein the extracting process is selected from the group consisting of a process based on compatibility of a processing system of a second business entity to receive the extracted subset, a process based on previous history of usefulness of prior extracted data, a process based on a model for managing the transactional subject and a process based on properties of the database; and

formatting the extracted relevant portion of the demand-indicating data into an extensible mark-up language document;

automatically transmitting the extracted relevant portion of the demand-indicating data from a first business entity to a second business entity over a communications network;

automatically feeding the transmitted demand-indicating data into an electronic processor for tracking the demand-indicating data, the electronic processor being associated with an electronic processing system of the second business entity; and

generating a business decision of at least one of the first business entity and the second business entity that is based on the demand-indicating data and that is made solely by the electronic processing system without the need for manual data entry into or manual data extraction from the electronic data processing system.

15. The method according to claim 14 wherein the transmitting comprises transmitting the extensible mark-up language document as the demand indicating data over the communications network.

16. The method according to claim 15 further comprising:

receiving the transmitted extensible mark-up language document; and

translating the extensible mark-up language document into a data format compatible with an enterprise planning resource system.

18. The method according to claim 14 further comprising displaying the demand-indicating data for a user affiliated with one of the first business entity and the second business entity.

19. The method according to claim 14 wherein the business decision comprises deciding to change the manufactured quantity of a material as the transactional subject.

20. The method according to claim 14 wherein the business decision comprises deciding to change a supply of material to fulfill a firm demand derived from the demand-indicating data.

21. The method according to claim 14 wherein the obtaining includes obtaining one of demand data and forecast data with respect to the transactional subject.

22. The method according to claim 14 wherein the first business entity represents a customer of a material as the transactional subject and wherein the second business entity represents a supplier of the material.

34. The method according to claim 7 wherein the business decision comprises an order processing decision.

35. The method according to claim 34 wherein the order processing decision comprises procuring a production material for either said first business entity or said second business entity.

36. The method according to claim 7 wherein the business decision comprises engaging in a commercial transaction involving the transactional subject.

37. The method according to claim 36 wherein the commercial transaction comprises purchase of the transactional subject.

38. The method according to claim 7 wherein the extracting process is based on properties of the database.

40. The method according to claim 14 wherein the extracting process is based on properties of the database.

42. The method according to claim 7 wherein the extracting process is based on compatibility of a processing system of a second business entity to receive the extracted subset.

43. The method according to claim 7 wherein the extracting process is based on a process based on previous history of usefulness of prior extracted data.

44. The method according to claim 7 wherein the extracting process is based on a process based on a model for managing the transactional subject.

45. The method according to claim 14 wherein the extracting process is based on compatibility of a processing system of a second business entity to receive the extracted subset.

46. The method according to claim 14 wherein the extracting process is based on a process based on previous history of usefulness of prior extracted data.

47. The method according to claim 14 wherein the extracting process is based on a process based on a model for managing the transactional subject.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.